| Operator: AMEREN ILLINOIS COMPANY  | Operator ID#: 32513 |
|--|---------------------|
| Inspection Date(s): 2/18/2014, 2/20/2014   | Man Days: 6         |
| Inspection Unit: PAWNEE  |                     |
| Location of Audit:   |                     |
| Exit Meeting Contact: John Bozarth   |                     |
| Inspection Type: Standard Inspection - Record Audit                              |                     |
| Pipeline Safety Representative(s): Kevin Hecker, Donald Hankins, Valerie Schwing |                     |
| Company Representative to Receive Report: Michael Fuller                         |                     |
| Company Representative's Email Address: mfuller2@ameren.com                      |                     |

| Headquarters Address Information: | 300 Liberty            |           |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
|                                   | Peoria, IL 61602       |           |
|                                   | Emergency Phone#:      |           |
|                                   | Fax#:                  |           |
| Official or Mayor's Name:         | Ron Pate               |           |
|                                   | Phone#: (217) 424-6518 |           |
|                                   | Email:                 |           |
| Inspection Contact(s)             | Title                  | Phone No. |
| John Bozarth                      | Managing Supervisor    |           |

| Gas System Operations  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| Gas Transporter  | Ameren Illinois |
| Annual Report (Form 7100.1-1) reviewed for the year:   | Satisfactory    |
| Unaccounted for Gas  | .53%            |
| Number of Services   | 825576          |
| Miles of Main  | 16888           |
| Is the operator maintaining documentation verifying their Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure(s)? (MAOP)        | Not Checked     |
| General Comment:   |                 |
| MAOP documentation is reviewed at each Ameren Operation Center. No MAOP records were reviewed during this audit. |                 |
| Operating Pressure (Feeder)  | Not Checked     |

| General Comment:   |   |                      |
|--|---|----------------------|
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| Operating Pressure (Town)  |   | Not Checked          |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| Operating Pressure (Other)                                       |   | Not Checked          |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| MAOP (Feeder)  |   | Not Checked          |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| MAOP (Town)  |   | Not Checked          |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| MAOP (Other)   |   | Not Checked          |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| These records are located at each operations center.             |   |                      |
| Does the operator have any transmission pipelines                | ?   | Yes                  |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| Ameren has 1250 miles of transmission pipeline.                  |   |                      |
| Regulatory   | Reporting Records   | Status               |
| [191.5]  | Were Telephonic Notices of Incidents reported to the NRC (800-424-8802)?                        | Satisfactory         |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| There were 2 incidents reported. One in Mattoon, one in Duqu     | oin. In both instances, it was determined that the explosions were not the fa                   | ult of the operator. |
| [191.9(a)]   | Was a DOT Incident Report Form F7100.1 submitted within 30 days after detection of an incident? | Not Applicable       |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |
| No F7100.1 was filed after investigations determined that the e. | xplosions were not the fault of the operator.   |                      |
| [191.9(b)]   | Were any supplemental incident reports submitted when deemed necessary?                         | Not Applicable       |
| General Comment:   |   |                      |

| No supplemental incident reports were filed after investi  | igations determined that the explosions were not the fault of the operator.   |                |
|--|---|----------------|
| Did the operator have any plastic pipe failure             | es in the past calendar year?   | No             |
| General Comment:   |   | •              |
| There were no plastic pipe failures within Ameren's gas    | system in 2013.   |                |
| Did the operator take action to mitigate safet components? | y concerns relating to the failure of the PE or pipeline  | Not Applicable |
| General Comment:   |   |                |
| There were no plastic pipe failures within Ameren's gas    | system in 2013.   |                |
| [191.23(a)]  | Did the operator report Safety Related Conditions?  | Not Applicable |
| General Comment:   | <u> </u>  |                |
| Ameren had no safety related conditions in 2013.           |   |                |
| [191.25]   | Did the Operator file a Safety Related Condition Report within 5 working days of determination, but not later than 10 working days after discovery?   | Not Applicable |
| General Comment:   | <u> </u>  |                |
| Ameren had no safety related conditions in 2013.           |   |                |
| [192.16(c)]  | Customer Notification: Has the operator notified each new customer within 90 days about the customer's responsibility regarding buried piping, however, operators of a master meter may continuously post a general notice in a permanent location? | Satisfactory   |
| General Comment:   | <u> </u>  |                |
| Ameren Illinois sends all new customers notification of r  | responsibility at the time the customer signs up for service.   |                |
|  | DRUG TESTING  | Status         |
| Refer to Drug and Alcohol Inspection Forms and Protocols   |   | Not Checked    |
| General Comment:   |   | •              |
| A review of Ameren's drug and alcohol plan was comple      | eted in 2011 and not part of this audit.  |                |
| TES  | ST REQUIREMENTS   | Status         |
| Category Comment:  |   |                |
| Pressure test records are housed at the local Operation    | Centers.  |                |
| [192.517(a)][192.505,192.507,192.511(c)]                   | Are pressure test records being maintained for piping operating above 100 psig?   | Not Checked    |
| [192.517(b)][192.511,192.509,192.513]                      | Are pressure test records being maintained for at least 5 years on piping operating below 100 psig?   | Not Checked    |

| [192.603(b)][192.725]   | Were service lines temporarily disconnected from the main properly tested prior to reconnection?   | Not Checked            |
|---|--|------------------------|
|   | UPRATING   | Status                 |
| [192.555][192.555]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of uprating activities when uprating a pipe to a pressure that will produce a hoop stress of 30% or more SMYS?                   | Not Checked            |
| General Comment:  | i i  |                        |
| All uprating records for transmission are housed                | in the Decatur office.   |                        |
| [192.557][192.557]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of uprating activities when uprating a pipe to a pressure that will produce a hoop stress of less than 30% SMYS?                 | Not Checked            |
| General Comment:  | ·  |                        |
| For any uprating under 30% of SMYS: Ameren I operating centers. | keeps all records for pipeline above 60 psig in Decatur. All records for pipeline 60 psig and  | under are in the local |
|   | OPERATIONS   | Status                 |
| [192.603(b)][192.605(a)]  | Has the operator conducted a review of the Operations and Maintenance Manual once per yr/15 months?  | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:  |  |                        |
| The operator was able to provide records from th                | ne Subject Matter Reference Meetings that were conducted throughout 2013.  |                        |
| Has the operator conducted a review o                           | f the Operator Qualification Plan once per yr/15 months?   | Yes                    |
| General Comment:  |  |                        |
| The operator was able to show that the OQ plan                  | review is part of the Subject Matter Reference Meetings.   |                        |
| [192.603(b)][192.605(b)(3)]                                     | Are construction records, maps, and operating history available to operating personnel?  | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:  |  |                        |
| The laptops in each truck contain the records, m                | aps and operating history.   |                        |
| [192.603(b)][192.605(b)(8)]                                     | Has the operator periodically reviewed personnel's work to determine the effectiveness of normal O&M procedures when deficiencies are found?                               | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |                        |
| The operator was able to provide documentation procedures.      | demonstrating that the QA reporting process addresses deficiencies in the effectiveness o  | f the normal O&M       |
| Staff reviewed 2013 Quality Assurance Results.                  |  |                        |
| CONTIN  | UING SURVEILLANCE RECORDS  | Status                 |
| [192.603(b)][192.613(a)]  | Has the operator reviewed continuing surveillance records for class location changes, failures, leak history, corrosion, changes in cathodic protection, and other unusual | Satisfactory           |

|   | operating and maintenance conditions?   |                         |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| General Comment:  | <u> </u>  | •                       |
| The operator was able to provide documenta as corrective actions taken. | tion of surveillance records taking into account class location changes, failures, leak history,  | corrosion, etc. as well |
| [192.491][192.489]  | Does the operator have records verifying if exposed cast iron was examined for evidence of graphitization and if necessary what appropriate action was taken concerning graphitization?   | Not Applicable          |
| General Comment:  |   |                         |
| The operator does not have any cast iron pip                            | e within the gas system.  |                         |
| [192.603(b)][192.755]   | Does the operator have surveillance records of cast iron pipelines, including appropriate action resulting from tracking circumferential cracking failures, study of leak history, or any other unusual operating and maintenance conditions? | Not Applicable          |
| General Comment:  |   |                         |
| The operator does not have any cast iron pip                            | e within the gas system.  |                         |
| [192.603(b)][192.753(a)]  | Is each cast iron caulked bell and spigot joint that is subject to a pressure of more than 25 (psig.) sealed as required?   | Not Applicable          |
| General Comment:  | <b>1</b> '  | ·                       |
| The operator does not have any caulked bell                             | and spigot joints within the gas system.  |                         |
| [192.603(b)][192.753(b)]  | Is each cast iron caulked bell and spigot joint that is subject to a pressure of 25 (psig.) or less and is exposed for any reason sealed as required?   | Not Applicable          |
| General Comment:  | <u> </u>  | •                       |
| The operator does not have any caulked bell                             | and spigot joints within the gas system.  |                         |
| QUALIF  | FICATION OF PIPELINE PERSONNEL  | Status                  |
| Refer to operator Qualification Inspection Forms and Protocols          |   | Yes                     |
| General Comment:  |   |                         |
| Staff completed PHMSA Form 14 related to to                             | ne operator's OQ plan.  |                         |
| DA  | MAGE PREVENTION RECORDS   | Status                  |
| [192.603(b)][191.11(a)]   | Did the operator track the number of damages per 1000 locate requests for the previous years?   | Satisfactory            |
| General Comment:  | ·   |                         |
| The operator was able to provide supporting                             | documentation for JULIE tickets, Damaged Services, Damaged Mains and Damages per 100  | 00 locates.             |

| Has the number of damages increased  | or decreased from prior year?  | Decreased              |
|--|--|------------------------|
| General Comment:   |  |                        |
| 2010 - 3.90 Total Gas Damages/1000 Locates<br>2011 - 3.35 Total Gas Damages/1000 Locates<br>2012 - 3.28 Total Gas Damages/1000 Locates<br>2013 - 2.88 Total Gas Damages/1000 Locates |  |                        |
| [192.603(b)][192.617]  | Does the operator track records of accidents due to excavation damage to ensure causes of failures are addressed to minimize the recurrence?                       | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:   |  |                        |
| The operator tracks records of all accidents, identi-  | ifies the cause and works with excavators to prevent future damages to the gas system.   |                        |
| [192.603(b)][192.614(c)(3)]  | Does the operator provide documentation pertaining to notification of excavation, marking, positive response, and the availability and use of the one call system? | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:   | •  |                        |
| Ameren is a member of JULIE. All tickets are sen   | t to the operator. A positive response is sent back to the excavator.  |                        |
| Does the operator have a Quality Assurated facilities?   | ance Program in place for monitoring the locating and marking of   | Yes                    |
| General Comment:   |  |                        |
| The operator hired 4 new Damage Prevention Speas well to review turn-around times.   | ecialists (now a total of 7 in the Ameren territory). A monthly meeting takes place with the   | e 2 locating companies |
| Do pipeline operators include performan  | nce measures in facility locating contracts?   | Yes                    |
| General Comment:   |  |                        |
| 98% of tickets must be worked within 24 hours of   | initial contact, per contract, and the turnaround for emergencies is 2 hours.  |                        |
| [IL ADM. CO.265.100(b)(1)]   | Was third party damage to mains involving a release of gas reported to ICC JULIE Enforcement? http://www.icc.illinois.gov/julie/                                   | Satisfactory           |
| General Comment:   |  |                        |
| The operator was able to demonstrate that excava   | ations resulting in a release of gas were reported to ICC JULIE Enforcement.   |                        |
| Has the Operator adopted applicable se   | ction of the Common Ground Alliance Best Practices?  | Yes                    |
| General Comment:   |  | L                      |
| The operator is a CGA member and includes Com  | nmon Ground Alliance best practices in the locator contracts.  |                        |
| If no, were Common Ground Alliance Be  | est Practices discussed with Operator?   | Not Applicable         |
| General Comment:   |  | 1                      |
|  | amon Cround Alliance heat practices in the leaster contracts   |                        |
| The operator is a CGA member and includes Com  | irnon Ground Alliance best practices in the locator contracts.   |                        |

| [192.603(b)][192.615(b)(1)]  |  |                                 |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| [192.003(b)][192.013(b)(1)]  | Are supervisors, responsible for emergency action, furnished copies of the latest edition of the Emergency Plan?   | Satisfactory                    |
| General Comment:   | <u> </u>   |                                 |
| EMER 2.04 of the operator's O&M contains the e   | emergency plan.  |                                 |
| [192.603(b)][192.615(b)(2)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation that the appropriate operating personnel have received training to assure they are knowledgeable of emergency procedures and that the training was effective?  | Satisfactory                    |
| General Comment:   | <u> </u>   |                                 |
| The operator conducts an interactive mock eme  | gency training session.  |                                 |
| [192.603(b)][192.615(b)(3)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of employee activity reviews to determine whether the procedures were effectively followed in each emergency?  | Satisfactory                    |
| [192.603(b)][192.615(c)]   | Has the operator maintained documentation that the operator established and maintained liaison with appropriate fire, police and other public officials?   | Satisfactory                    |
| General Comment:   |  |                                 |
| General Comment.   |  |                                 |
|  | of all liaison meetings for 2013, including sign in sheets showing the department represent  | ted and person(s)               |
| The operator was able to provide documentation   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  | ted and person(s)  Satisfactory |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate   |                                 |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate   |                                 |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  |                                 |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS   | Satisfactory                    |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC A  | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS   | Satisfactory  Status            |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC A  Refer to Public Awareness Program In  | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS  Spection Forms and Protocols   | Satisfactory  Status            |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC A  Refer to Public Awareness Program In General Comment:   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS  Spection Forms and Protocols   | Satisfactory  Status            |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC A  Refer to Public Awareness Program In General Comment:   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS  Spection Forms and Protocols  In this audit. See Inspection Documents.                     | Satisfactory  Status  Yes       |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC A  Refer to Public Awareness Program In  General Comment:  The Public Awareness Plan was reviewed during   | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS  Spection Forms and Protocols  In this audit. See Inspection Documents.  ODORIZATION OF GAS | Satisfactory  Status  Yes       |
| The operator was able to provide documentation attending the meeting.  [192.603(b)][192.615(a)(3)]  General Comment:  56 total 27 within the hour had no-one respond a PUBLIC ATTENDED PUBLIC AWARENESS Plan was reviewed during Category Comment: | Did the review of emergency response time intervals regarding odor/leak complaint documentation indicate adequate emergency response intervals were achieved?  In all. 29 of the 56 had non-qualified personnel as first responders.  WARENESS PROGRAM - RECORDS  Spection Forms and Protocols  In this audit. See Inspection Documents.  ODORIZATION OF GAS | Satisfactory  Status  Yes       |

| Abandonment or Deactivation records are housed at the local [192.603(b)][192.727(b)] | Did the operator maintain documentation demonstrating  |             |
|--|--|-------------|
| Category Comment:  |  |             |
| ABANDONMENT or DEACTI  | VATION of FACILITIES PROCEDURES  | Status      |
| [192.723(b)(1),192.723(b)(2)][220 ILCS 2.2.03]                                       | After the determination of the cathodic protection requirements, has the operator surveyed each line within the required leakage survey intervals?   | Not Checked |
| [192.463,220 ILCS 2.2.03][220 ILCS 2.2.03]   | Has the operator determined if cathodic protection is required on these services?  | Not Checked |
| [220 ILCS 2.2.03]  | Has the operator designated and documented the location of all services where the meter is located more than 3 feet away from the wall of a residence?   | Not Checked |
| Yard Line records are housed at the local Operation Centers.                         |  |             |
| Category Comment:  |  |             |
| YARD LIN   | IES - RESIDENTIAL  | Status      |
| [192.603(b)][192.723(b)(2)]  | Is the operator performing leakage surveys outside a business district at a minimum of every 5 years/63 months? Is the operator performing leakage surveys on cathodically unprotected pipelines at a minimum of every 3 years/39 months? If the operator has inside meter sets that meet this criterion then were those surveyed? If the operator has yard lines then are those being surveyed? | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.723(b)(1)]  | Is the operator performing leakage surveys in business districts at a minimum of 1 per year/ 15 months? If the operator has inside meter sets that meet this criterion then were those surveyed?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.721(b)(2)]  | Is the operator patrolling outside business districts at a minimum of 2 per year/7 1/2 months?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.721(b)(1)]  | Is the operator patrolling business districts at a minimum of 4 per year/4 1/2 months?   | Not Checked |
| Patrolling and Leakage Survey records are housed at the loc                          | al Operation Centers.  |             |
| Category Comment:  |  |             |
| PATROLLING   | 6 & LEAKAGE SURVEY   | Status      |
| [192.603(b)][192.625(f)(2)]  | Has the master meter operator maintained documentation of sniff tests performed as required by this section?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.625(f)(1)]  | Are master meter operators receiving written verification of odorant concentration levels from their gas supplier?   | Not Checked |

| Category Comment:   | MAINTENANCE  | Status      |
|---|--|-------------|
| [192.603(b)][192.743(a)]                                      | If Yes, does the operator have documentation to verify that these devices have adequate capacity?  | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.743(a),192.743(b),192.195(b)(2)              | Is overpressure protection provided by the supplier pipeline downstream of the take point?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.741(c)]                                      | If there were indications of abnormally high- or low-<br>pressure, were actions taken to correct any unsatisfactory<br>operating conditions?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.741(a),192.741(b)]                           | Is each distribution system supplied by more than one district pressure regulating station, or where required by the operator on a system supplied by a single regulating station, equipped with telemetering or recording pressure gauges to indicate the gas pressure in the district? | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.743(b)]                                      | If the operator used calculations to determine sufficient capacity, were the calculation reviews documented at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months?  | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.743(a)]                                      | Is the operator inspecting pressure limiting and regulating stations for adequate capacity at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.739(a)]                                      | Is the operator inspecting and testing the pressure limiting and regulating stations at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months?   | Not Checked |
| Pressure Limiting and Regulation records are housed at the lo | cal Operation Centers.   |             |
| PRESSURE LIMI Category Comment:                               | TING AND REGULATION  | Status      |
| [192.727(g)][192.727(g)]                                      | Did the operator maintain documentation for each abandoned onshore pipeline facility that crosses over, under or through a commercially navigable waterway?  | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.727(e)]                                      | Did the operator maintain documentation when air was used for purging that a combustible mixture was not present after purging?  | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.727(d)]                                      | Did the operator maintain documentation demonstrating that whenever service to a customer was discontinued access to gas was either; locked, prevented by a mechanical fitting, or disconnected from the gas supply and open pipe ends sealed?   | Not Checked |
| [192.603(b)][192.727(c)]                                      | Did the operator maintain documentation demonstrating that each inactive pipeline that is not being maintained under this part was disconnected from all sources and supplies of gas; purged of gas?   | Not Checked |

Unless otherwise noted, all code references are to 49CFR Part 192. If an item is marked Unsatisfactory, Not Applicable, or Not Checked, an explanation must be included in this report.

| Valve Maintenance records are housed at the local Op   | peration Centers.  |              |
|--|--|--------------|
| [192.603(b)][192.747(a),192.747(b)]  | Did the operator inspect and maintain distribution valves necessary for the safe operation of the system at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months? | Not Checked  |
| [192.603(b)][192.749(a)]   | Did the operator inspect and maintain vaults > 200 cubic feet at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months?  | Not Checked  |
| Inv  | estigation Of Failures   | Status       |
| [192.603(b)][192.617]  | Did the operator experience accidents or failures requiring analysis?  | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| The operator was able to provide documentation of all  | failures required to be analyzed for 2013.   |              |
| WE   | LDING OF STEEL PIPE  | Status       |
| [192.603(b)][192.225(b)]   | Does the operator have documentation for their qualified welding procedure?  | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| The operator's welding procedures are included in the  | O&M.   |              |
| [192.603(b)][192.227,192.229]  | Does the operator have documentation of welder qualification documentation as required?  | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| Staff reviewed documentation of welder qualification/r   | e-qualification.   |              |
| [192.709][192.243(b)(2)]   | Does the operator have documentation of NDT personnel qualification as required?   | Not Checked  |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| The NDT records were reviewed at a previous audit a  | t Decatur Plaza.   |              |
| [192.709][192.243(f)]  | Does the operator have documentation of NDT testing performed?   | Not Checked  |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| The NDT records were reviewed at a previous audit a  | t Decatur Plaza.   |              |
| JOINING OF MATERIAL OTHER THAN WELDING   |  | Status       |
| [192.603(b)][192.285]  | Are persons making joints with plastic pipe qualified?   | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   | ·  |              |
| The operator was able to provide documentation of quantum of quantum of the control of the contr | ualification for persons making plastic joints.  |              |
| [192.603(b)][192.287]  | Are persons inspecting plastic pipe joints qualified?  | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   | <u>.                                      </u>   |              |

AMEREN ILLINOIS COMPANY/2-20-2014

Page 10 of 14

| The operator was able to provide documentation of qualifica- |  |              |
|--|--|--------------|
| [192.603(b)][192.283]  | Are qualified joining procedures for plastic pipe in place?  | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:   |  |              |
| The joining procedures are located in section "POLY - Poly   | ethylene Pipe" of the operator's O&M.  |              |
| CORROSIO   | N CONTROL RECORDS  | Status       |
| Category Comment:  |  |              |
| Corrosion Control records are housed at the local Operation  | n Centers.   |              |
| [192.491(a)][192.491(a)]                                     | Has the operator maintained maps or records of cathodically protected piping, cathodic protection facilities, galvanic anodes, and neighboring structures bonded to the cathodic protection system?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.459]   | Has the operator maintained documentation of an examination when buried pipe was exposed?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.465(a)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of annual pipe-to-soil monitoring performed at a minimum of 1 per yr/15 months and/or isolated services or short sections of main less than 100 feet at a minimum of 10% annually?                                   | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.465(b)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of rectifier or other impressed current power sources inspections at a minimum of 6 per year/ 2 1/2 months?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.465(c)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of each critical interference bond, reverse current switch, diode, etc. inspections at a minimum of 6 per year/ 2 1/2 months and/or non-critical interference bond inspections at a minimum of 1 per year/15 months? | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.465(d)]  | Has the operator taken prompt remedial actions to correct any deficiencies indicated by the monitoring?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.465(e)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of unprotected pipeline surveys, inspections, or tests at a minimum of 3 years/39 months?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.467(a),192.467(c),192.467(d)]                  | Has the operator maintained documentation of inspections or tests for electrical isolation at casings?   | Not Checked  |
| 192.491][192.469]  | Does the operator have a sufficient number of test stations or other contact points for electrical measurement to determine the adequacy of cathodic protection?   | Not Checked  |
| 192.491][192.471]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of corrective actions taken when a test lead is no longer electrically conductive?   | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.473(b)]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of inspections or tests to assure their cathodic protection system is not  | Not Checked  |

|   | affecting adjacent underground metallic structures?   |              |
|---|---|--------------|
| [192.491][192.475(a)]   | Has the operator maintained documentation of investigations or steps taken to minimize internal corrosion due to transportation of corrosive gas?   | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.475(b)]   | Has the operator maintained documentation of internal surface inspections performed when pipe is removed for any reason?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.477]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of internal corrosion coupon monitoring at a minimum of 2 per year/ 7 1/2 months?   | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.481]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of atmospheric corrosion control monitoring at a minimum of 1 per 3 years/ 39 months?   | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.479]  | Has the operator maintained documentation of corrective action where atmospheric corrosion was discovered?  | Not Checked  |
| [192.491][192.483(a),192.483(b),192.483(c)]   | Has the operator maintained documentation demonstrating that pipe removed due to external corrosion has been repaired or replaced with pipe that was coated and cathodically protected?   | Not Checked  |
| TRAINING - 83 IL ADM. CODE 520  |   |              |
| [520.10(a) (1)]   | Has the operator maintained documentation demonstrating   | Satisfactory |
|   | that personnel have received adequate training?   | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:  | that personnel have received adequate training?   | Satisfactory |
| General Comment:  O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja   |   | Satisfactory |
|   |   | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja   |   | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja<br>Apprenticeship program.  |   | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja<br>Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  |   | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja<br>Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  Leak investigation review   |   | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja<br>Apprenticeship program.<br>Mock emergency scenarios<br>Leak investigation review<br>6 week program for new welders   | Do training records include verbal instruction and/or on the  |              |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Ja<br>Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  Leak investigation review 6 week program for new welders  [520.10(a) (2)]   | Do training records include verbal instruction and/or on the job training for each job classification?  |              |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Jack Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  Leak investigation review 6 week program for new welders  [520.10(a) (2)]  General Comment:  | Do training records include verbal instruction and/or on the job training for each job classification?  |              |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Jack Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  Leak investigation review 6 week program for new welders  [520.10(a) (2)]  General Comment:  The operator has a 27-36 month Apprenticeship program, or             | Do training records include verbal instruction and/or on the job training for each job classification?  depending upon the legacy company.  Has the municipal operator maintained documentation demonstrating that personnel have received adequate | Satisfactory |
| O&M reviews to correspond with 2 updates to the O&M (Jack Apprenticeship program.  Mock emergency scenarios  Leak investigation review 6 week program for new welders  [520.10(a) (2)]  General Comment:  The operator has a 27-36 month Apprenticeship program, of [520.10(b)] | Do training records include verbal instruction and/or on the job training for each job classification?  depending upon the legacy company.  Has the municipal operator maintained documentation demonstrating that personnel have received adequate | Satisfactory |

|  | materials, new methods of operation and installation, and changes in general procedures? |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| General Comment:   |  |  |  |  |
| The operator releases periodic "Action Matters" newsletters as a reminder for correct O&M procedures or to address issues that have arisen in the field. |  |  |  |  |